

MAY 4 1927

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XX, No. 24

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1927

WHOLE NO. 554

“A REAL FIND---”

BECAUSE

1. “It is a means of bridging the all-too-wide gulf between first and second year Latin”.
2. “The appeal of the stories and the easy arrangement of the material make it a book that cannot be excelled as a text for beginning Latin classes”.
3. It is of “great value in maintaining the interest in the study of Latin”.
4. “You can hardly conceive the confidence-gain that accompanied the introduction of JULIA”.
5. “The boys especially like the pirate story and one boy remarked ‘Why, it is like any story book, isn’t it?’”
6. “The arrangement and vocabulary of the book are excellent”.
7. “There is enough variety in content to make a lasting appeal to the student”.
8. “The stories afford excellent material for sight translation”.
9. “It arouses interest and enlivens the Latin period”.
10. “It is the best help for getting interest and enthusiasm in beginning Latin classes”.
11. “It is an attractive, carefully graded little reader, at a reasonable price”.

Price 48 cents

JULIA: A Latin Reading Book

by Maud Reed

Author also of CAMILLA, a Latin Reading Book

In the ELEMENTARY LATIN CLASSICS.

Send for descriptive material on this series of supplementary Latin readers.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK BOSTON ATLANTA DALLAS CHICAGO SAN FRANCISCO

Franklin and Greene's Selections from Latin Prose Authors for Sight Reading

By SUSAN BRALEY FRANKLIN, Ph.D., formerly Head of Latin Department, Ethical Culture School, New York, and ELLA CATHERINE GREENE, A.B., formerly Instructor in Latin, The Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa. \$0.64.

IN this sight reading material for students in the last year of the High School or in the Freshman year in College, the passages chosen have typical difficulties of syntax, order, and vocabulary.

The work provides rare training in mastering the language and in reading more advanced authors. Inasmuch as the book is not intended to displace any part of the usual course, the selections have not been taken from the texts ordinarily read in Schools.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA



The Ayes Have It! If Roman Senators had to vote on the merits of a book teaching their own tongue and imparting a knowledge of their own civilization, they would endorse the eloquence of their Censor, Appius Claudius, when he praised

GRAY AND JENKINS' LATIN FOR TODAY

1. It embodies the recommendations of the Classical Investigation for the work of the first year.
2. It is notable for the arrangement of lessons which emphasize not only forms of grammar, but the application of Latin to English and the historical and social backgrounds of Roman life.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago London
Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XX, No. 24

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1927

WHOLE NO. 554

GENDERS IN JINGLES¹

My neighbor Mr. Kelly is a lawyer, but, since he once did some University teaching, he does not regard professors as semiparasites with no visible means of support. Accordingly, I feel that his questions about my teaching are not actuated merely by a perfunctory sense of politeness, and so, even when he challenges me on details of my work, I am willing to reply cheerfully. The other day he sank into the seat beside me on the express at Hoboken, and began his crossexamination before our engine had fairly puffed its way out of the train-shed.

"You had a good deal of Latin in College", he began; "just how well do you remember the genders of Latin nouns of the Third Declension?"

Now I can still pluck the meaning from a line or two of Latin if the construction is not too involved, but most of the verb-forms in the subjunctive and most of the rules for genders and the exceptions to the rules have become very faint in my mind. Besides, my friend would not have asked the question if he had expected me to answer it correctly, or if he had been unprepared to answer it himself. So I confessed my ignorance and gave him the chance for which he was looking. It was not his recital of the rules that surprised me so much as the fact that they poured from his lips in rhythmic, rhyming jingles with which my early drill in Allen and Greenough and in Bennett had not familiarized me. The mnemonic scheme used by Mr. Kelly aroused my curiosity and set me to looking for similar devices. Some of the results of my search are here set forth. Although my investigations were by no means complete, I found myself surprised by the variety of such jingles, by the extent of their adaptation to all kinds of teaching, and, finally, by the apparent antiquity of most of them².

About the first that I encountered was the medieval scheme for remembering the valid moods of the Aristotelian syllogism, familiar to every student of logic: "Barbara, Celarent, Darii, Ferioque prioris", etc. The professor of logic who quoted this fluently to me gave me one or two additional rhymes which I did not know, and which seem rather out of his department. Here is the rhyme used, by reference to the initial letters, for drilling the names of the twelve pairs of

¹The author of this paper is Professor of English in Washington Square College, New York University.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.81-87, under the title A Grammatical Excursion, Professor Frank Gardner Moore, of Columbia University, discussed the history of efforts to "cultivate that artificiosa memoria to which Cicero, the Auctor ad Herennium and Quintilian devote whole pages" (81); he gave, also, many examples of mnemonic devices applied to the study of Latin grammar. Professor Watt's paper is not concerned with the history of the subject. His examples are, in the main, different from those selected by Professor Moore. His paper is of special interest precisely because it is written by one not professionally concerned with Latin. C. K.>

²Professor Moore's paper explains this antiquity. C. K.>

cranial nerves (olfactory, optical, etc.) into the heads of medical students:

On old Olympus' piney tops
A fat-armed German picked some hops.

I found that my friends of the German Department were more given to the use of mnemonic devices than were teachers of other languages (including English). I do not know the extent to which the 'Direct Method' of instruction has cut into the old mnemonic drill-system in teaching German, but I have heard instructors of German recite jingles frequently, and in the German Grammar of E. S. Joynes, based on that of A. L. Meissner (New York, D. C. Heath and Company), appear "the well-known doggerel lines of the German grammars": see page 377 of the 1904 edition.

But let us return to the use of jingles for drill in rules of gender in Latin. My friend Mr. Kelly learned the rules while he was a student in St. Benedict's College in Newark, New Jersey. From this College he was graduated in 1897, with the Latin jingles, as we have seen, firm in his memory. To Father Cornelius, Director of the College until his retirement about a year ago, I am indebted for a copy of the rules, and I reproduce them here *verbatim*:

RULES OF GENDER

Third Declension

Masculine

Rule: All words ending in *o*, *or*, *os*, and *er*, and those in *es* with increase, are *masculine*.

Exceptions in *O*.

Feminine are words in *do*, *go*, *io*,
And *caro* and *echo* likewise so;
But *masculines* are: *scipio*,
Ordo, *cardo*, *harpago*,
Stellio, *septentrio*,
Margo, *ligo*, *pugio*,
Titio, *papilio*,
Unio, *curculio*,
And lastly *vespertilio*.

Exceptions in *OR*.

Neuters there are four in *or*:
Marmor, *aquor*, *ador*, *cor*,
But *feminini generis*
Alone is *arbor* (*arboris*).

Exceptions in *OS*.

Three are *feminine* in *os*:
Cos, *dos*, and *eos*;
But *os*, the mouth and *os*, the bone,
Neuter still claims as its own.

Exceptions in *ER*.

Neuters there are many in *er*:
Ver, *cadaver*, *tuber*, *iter*,
Cicer, *piper*, *siser*, *uber*,
Zingiber, *papaver*, *suber*,
Acer, *siler*, *verber*, *sphynther*,
But as *common* we use *linter*.

Exceptions in *ES*.

Among words with increase in *es*:
We find a *neuter* namely *aes*;
Yet *feminine* are: *requies*,
And *quies*, *merces*, *merges*, *teges*,
With *compes*, *inquies*, and *seges*.

Feminine

Rule: Words ending in *as*, *is*, *aus*, *ys*, and *x*, those in *es*, not increasing, and those in *s* preceded by a consonant, are *feminine*.

Exceptions in *AS*.

Three *masculines* there are in *as*:
As, *adamas* and *elephas*,
Yet *vas* (*vasis*) and *fas*, *nefas*,
To *neuter* must be placed by *us*.

Exceptions in *IS*.

Many there are words in *is*,
Masculini generis:
Panis, *piscis*, *crinis*, *finis*,
Ignis, *lapis*, *pulvis*, *cinis*,
Orbis, *amnis*, *et canalis*,
Sanguis, *unguis*, *glis*, *annalis*,
Fascis, *axis*, *funis*, *ensis*,
Fustis, *vectis*, *vomis*, *mensis*,
Vermis, *torris*, *cucumis*,
Postis, *follis*, *mugilis*,
Cassis, *caulis*, *callis*, *collis*,
Sentis, *torquis*, *penis*, *pollis*.

Exceptions in *X*.

All words are *masculine* in *ex*,
But *forfex*, *lex*, *supellex*, and *nex*.
As *masculines* in *ax* and *ux*
Remember *thorax* and *tradux*.

Exceptions in *S* preceded by a consonant.

Masculines are *torrens*,
Fons, *mons*, *pons*, *dens*, *oriens*,
Adeps, *rudens*, *occidens*.

Neuter

Rule: The *a*, *e*, *c*,
The *l*, *n*, *t*,
The *ar*, *ur*, *us*,
Are *neutrius*.

Exceptions in *L*.
Sol, *sal* and *mugil* are *masculine*.

Exceptions in *N*.
Masculines are *ren*,
Pecten, *lien*, *splen*.

Exceptions in *UR*.
Masculines are: *fur*, *furfur*,
Astur, *turtur*, *vultur*.

Exceptions in *US*.
Lepus and *mus* are *masculine*.
But *feminine* have always been:
Juventus, *virtus*, *servitus*,
Senectus, *tellus*, *grus*,
Incus, *sus* et *salus*,
With *pecus* (*pecudis*) and *palus*.

Fourth Declension

Rule: Words ending in *us* are *masculine*, those in *u* are *neuter*.

Exceptions.

Feminines there are in *us*:
Tribus, *acus*, *porticus*,
Domus, *nurus*, *socrus*, *anus*,
Idus (*iduum*) and *manus*.

U. I. O. G. D.

For all I know these jingles are as ancient as the jingle for the moods in logic, and it has occurred to me as possible that in Catholic Latin Schools they enjoyed a traditional use which they have lost in American Public Schools. At least they do not appear in the two American Latin Grammars which are on my shelves, the one by Allen and Greenough, the other by Bennett. In these two standard Grammars the rules of gender in the Third Declension are in straight prose. In the Latin Grammar of J. B. Allen⁴, however, published at Oxford in 1874, or about the same year that saw the first edition of Allen and Greenough, the jingles for gender are printed in the Appendix, with no word of introduction or apology (see pages 118-121, revised edition). Query: Did the English Latinists as a rule stick more religiously to their medieval predecessors than the younger scholars in the new world?⁴ In J. B. Allen's Grammar there are general rules as well as mnemonic lines for different declensions. Thus, the school-boy is told (§ 154: page 118) that

Males, Mountains, Months, the Winds, the Stream, And People Masculine we deem;
Isles are Feminine; to these
Add **Females, Cities, Countries, Trees**:
Indeclinables we call
Neuter gender, one and all.

Similarly, in twelve lines, he learns that

Common are to either sex
Artifex, and opifex....

The jingles for the Third and Fourth Declensions are worth quoting for the sake of comparison with the list from St. Benedict's College. It should be noted that Allen's Grammar retains the jingle for masculine terminations in *er*, *or*, *o*, *os*, and *es*, with increase, whereas the Catholic list has lost it.

(c) *Third Declension.* Gender various, according to termination of Nom. Case.

(1) Masculine terminations:-

Masculines *-er*, *-or*, and *-o*, *-os*, and *-es* increasing, shew.

Exceptions:-

-er. *Cadaver*, and all *plants* in *-er*,
With *iter*, *uber*, *verber*, *ver*,
To the *Neuters* we refer;
One is Feminine, *linter*.

-or. Four in *-or*, are Neuter, *cor*,
Marmor, *aequor*, and *ador*;
One is Feminine, *arbor*.

-o. *Caro*, *flesh*, and endings three,
-do, *-io*, *-go*, must reckoned be
In Feminino Genere.

-os. Feminine are *cos* and *dos*;
With the *Neuters* reckon *os*.

-es, increasing. Feminine are *compes*, *teges*,
Merces, *merges*, *quies*, *seges*.

Aes (*aeris*), is Neuter.

<⁴The second edition of John Barrow Allen, *An Elementary Latin Grammar*, appeared in 1877 (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press). The book has since been often reprinted.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.87 Professor Moore notes that Professor Gardner M. Lane, in his fine book, *A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges* (American Book Company, 1898; revised edition, 1903), gave only one rhyming rule (§ 579), but that Professor Morris H. Morgan, in his book, *A School Latin Grammar, Chiefly from Lane's Latin Grammar* (American Book Company, 1899), gave in §§ 207-220, many such rules. In his Preface (iv) Professor Morgan says, "The versified rules for gender were chiefly drawn up by Professor Lane some twenty years ago". He gives no source either for Professor Lane's rules or for his own additions to them or modifications of them. C. K. >

<⁴The answer is Yes. For the use of mnemonic devices in England in the study of Latin Grammar, illustrated especially in the Elementary Grammar of the Latin Language, by B. H. Kennedy, see Professor Moore, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.87. C. K. >

(2) Feminine terminations:—

Feminines **-do**, **-io**, **-go**,
-is, **-as**, **-aus**, and **-x**, will shew,
-es, if no *increase* is needed,
-s by Consonant preceded.

Exceptions:—

-do, **-go**, **-io**. Males are *ligo*, *vespertilio*, *Cardo*, *ordo*, and *papilio*,

Pugio, *scipio*, and *quaternio*, *Curculio*, *harpago*, and *ternio*.

-is. Many Latin Nouns in **-is**

Are *Masculini Generis*?:

Amnis, *axis*, *fascis*, *folis*,

Callis, *caulis*, *crinis*, *collis*,

Fustis, *ignis*, *orbis*, *ensis*,

Panis, *piscis*, *postis*, *mensis*,

Torris, *unguis*, and *annalis*,

Glis, *natalis*, and *canalis*,

Vectis, *vermis*, *cucumis*,

Lapis, *pulvis*, and *cinis*,

Sanguis, *sentis*, and *vomis*.

Chiefly Masculine are *clunis*,

Corbis, *torquis*, *finis*, *funis*.

-as. As, *adamas*, and *elephas*,

Are *Masculina*; Neuter *vas*.

x. Male are Nouns in **e plus x**,

Save *nex*, *supellex*, *forfex*, *lex*,

Common *imbrex*, and *obex*,

Pumex, *cortex*, and *silex*.

Three are Masculine in **-ix**,

Fornix, *phoenix*, and *calix*.

-es not increasing. Two are Masculine in **-es**,

Verres and *actinaces*.

-s preceded by a Consonant. Masculine are *fons*

and *mons*,

Rudens, *torrens*, *dens*, and *pons*,

Chalybs, *hydrops*, *tridens*, *cliens*,

Fractions of the *as*, *as triens*,

Bidens [hoe] and *confluens*,

Oriens and *occidens*.

Common Gender is *forceps*,

Common also *stirps*, *adeps*.

(3) Neuter terminations:—

Neuters end in **-a**, **-e**, **-e**,

-ar, **-ur**, **-us**, **-l**, **-n**, and **-t**.

Exceptions:—

-ur. Four are Masculine in **-ur**,

Furfur, *turtur*, *vultur*, *fur*.

-us. Feminine are some in **-us**

Increasing long, as *servitus*,

Tellus, *juventus*, *incus*, *palus*,

Virtus, *senectus*, *atque salus*;

And [Genitive, *pecudis*] *pecus*.

Masculine are *lepus*, *mus*.

-l. Masculines in **-l** are *mugil*,

Sal and *consul*, *sol* and *pugil*.

-n. Males in **-n** are *ren* and *splen*,

Lien, *pecten*, *attagen*.

(d) *Fourth Declension*. **-us**, Masculine; **-u**, Neuter.

Exceptions:—

-us. Feminine are *trees* in **-us**,

With *tribus*, *acus*, *porticus*,

Domus, *Idus* and *manus*.

The English grammarian's list may have an immediate antecedent in England⁴; the Catholic College list is probably German, since the Benedictines in the Newark College came originally from Germany. Mr. Kelly reported to me, however, that an Italian priest whom he met in Palermo several years ago recited the same jingles, with Latin instead of English links. I secured also a German list, drilled into the

⁴This list was cited by Professor Moore, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.87. C. K.

⁵It has, in Kennedy's Latin Grammar. See above, Note 4. C. K.

young head of a friend of mine by a conscientious Latin drillmaster in the Lateinschule of Winnweiler, Germany, in 1888-1889. He did not give me the whole of the list, but here are some of the general rules, and a partial list for the Third Declension. I noted with interest that in the word-list as he gave it to me he had made one or two slips; this shows that the jingle remained after the sense had disappeared. I corrected the slips by checking against the list in Allen.

Rule of Gender in Latin

Die Männer, Völker, Flüsse, Wind,
 Und Monat *Masculina* sind.
 Die Weiber, Bäume, Städte, Land,
 Und Inseln weiblich sind benannt.
 Was man nicht deklinieren kann,
 Das sieht man als ein Neutrum an.

Rule of Gender in Third Declension

Die Wörter auf "is" sind Feminina; Masculina sind:

Panis, piscis, crinis, finis,
 Ignis, lapis, pulvis, cinis,
 Orbis, amnis, unguis, ensis,
 Collis, fascis, vermis, mensis,
 Fustis, sanguis, funis, axis,
 Vomis, cucumis.

The rest is silence. Either my German friend was not drilled as well as the Catholic lawyer, or his memory is shorter.

The geographical distribution of these mnemonic devices as well as their essential similarity is very striking. That they are not all exactly alike will be seen by a comparison of those for the Third Declension, for different rhyming words have been used for different jingles. But the essential plan is the same, and the same doggerel meter (iambic or trochaic tetrameter in rhyming couplets) is used in all. Although I have not traced them to their ultimate source, they all seem to lead to a common origin in the monkish Schools of the Middle Ages. I should not be surprised, moreover, to have some Latinist tell me that many of the words in the jingles are not classical Latin at all, but belong to the group which crept in through the Church and Universities long after Catullus and Lesbia were dust together, and Martial's bitter pen had been laid aside.

It is not a part of my plan to comment on the educational value of these devices. However, I cannot pass over one or two observations which I made while I was collecting the material. I suspect that children often memorized these rhymes parrot-fashion without acquiring at the same time any capacity for using out of its setting the information thus gained. Thus the mnemonic device may have become a meaningless substitute for genuine knowledge that could be applied. Moreover, in order that the word-lists might be complete, and all exceptions included, many very obscure and rare words were woven in with the more familiar words with the result that the youngster's mind was cluttered up with words which he never encountered in his reading⁵. Allen has given in footnotes all the English equivalents of the words in his Latin lists. In those lists I recognized many old friends, such as

⁵I strongly suspect that this observation explains, in very large part, why these mnemonic devices went out of use. C. K.

lapis, pulvis, sanguis, etc. But a good many more, I feel certain, I never met in either my High School or my College reading of Latin. The next time I meet my lawyer friend who recites so glibly the list of exceptions in genders in the Third Declension, I will do a bit of cross-examining myself in order to find out if he really knows that *cucumis* means 'cucumber', *follis* 'a pair of bellows', *glis* 'a dormouse', and *curculio* a 'weevil'. I did not know these words, and a professor of Latin on whom I tried them flunked disgracefully.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

HOMER A. WATT

REVIEWS

Die Landwirtschaft im Hellenistischen Aegypten. Erster Band: Der Betrieb der Landwirtschaft. Von Michael Schnebel. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (1925). Pp. xvii + 379.

All those who, like myself, have made the study of papyrology one of their special fields of research have felt, seriously, the need of a good monograph on agriculture in Hellenistic Egypt. It is well known that Egypt was devoted to agriculture more completely than was any other land of the ancient world. To agriculture, to the fertile soil, and to the regular annual floods of the Nile Egypt owed the early brilliant development of its civilization, and the continuity of that civilization, which lasted almost uninterrupted for many millenia, indeed until the neglect and the foolishness of men undermined the vital forces of the land, forces based on the application of agriculture and irrigation to the natural fertility of the soil, as perpetually renewed by the Nile. The efficient organization, by priests and kings, of the dense population of Egypt for work on its fields and meadows brought about the great political, cultural, and economic development of the country. That organization, thus directed, first made Egypt the leading country of the world politically, culturally, economically, and, later, secured for it great importance in the Hellenistic period, and, finally, determined its place as one of the richest and most civilized provinces of the Roman Empire.

No wonder, therefore, that all the sources of our information concerning ancient Egypt, from the very earliest times, are full of references to agriculture. The bas-reliefs and the paintings of Pharaonic Egypt, beginning with the Early Kingdom and extending to the time of the Persian conquest (compare the grave of Petosiris, recently discovered), illustrate, in all its details, the agricultural life of the country. The information thus supplied has been collected, recently, by Erman-Ranke¹, Wreszinski², Montet³, and Miss Hartmann⁴. Full of references to agriculture are, also, the scores of thousands of papyrus documents,

¹Adolf Erman, *Aegypten und Aegyptisches Leben im Altertum*. Neu bearbeitet von Hermann Ranke (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1923).

²Walter Wreszinski, *Atlas zur Altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1914-1923).

³Paul Montet, *Les Scènes de la Vie Privée dans les Tombeaux Egyptiens de l'Ancienne Empire* (Paris, Gamber, 1923).

⁴Fernande Hartmann, *L'Agriculture dans l'Ancienne Egypt* (Paris, 1923).

Greek, Latin, Demotic, Coptic, from the Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, and Arabic periods in the life of Egypt. Yet, though many scholars have devoted monographs, or pages in more general works, to various questions connected with agriculture in the so-called Hellenistic period of Egypt⁵, no one had attacked the problem as a whole. We must, therefore, be grateful to Professor W. Otto, who began collecting the material for such a monograph and gave the task of completing, systematizing, and working out this material to his various pupils. One of these pupils, Michael Schnebel, finally succeeded in presenting this material in printed form to his fellow-students of papyrology. The first volume, which is here under review, deals only with the technical side of agriculture, "Der Betrieb der Landwirtschaft". The economic side of the problem, "Der Haushalt", is reserved for the second volume. I do not know how Mr. Schnebel has planned his second volume. I would emphatically advise him *not* to follow the plan of Volume 1. I would have him separate sharply the Hellenistic period and the Roman period. Within the sections of his work, thus sharply differentiated, I would have him pay careful attention to the various types of agricultural concerns: the domains of the State (i. e. of the Kings and the Emperors), the large estates (*latifundia*), the smaller estates of the bourgeoisie, and the peasant plots.

Volume 1 is divided into seven chapters, whose contents are as follows: I. The division of the land from the agricultural point of view: the chapter deals with the various types of land (7-29); II. Irrigation (29-84); III. Manuring (84-94); IV. Work on the fields, in connection with the cereals, the oil plants, vegetables, grass, and, finally, the rotation of crops (94-239); V. The cultivation of the vine, and the making of wines (234-292); VI. The cultivation of fruit-trees (293-315); VII. Grazing (316-358).

The treatment of all these subjects is systematic, not historical. We must not forget that agriculture is one of the most conservative phases of economic life in general, and that innovations in this field are exceptional. Yet I must express my regret that more attention was not paid by Mr. Schnebel to the historical evolution of agriculture in Egypt. It would be highly instructive to have a parallel between the technique of the Pharaonic times and that of the Hellenistic period, and it would be of great importance for the historian to know what kinds of changes were effected in the Roman times as compared with the Ptolemaic period, and whether the economic decay of the late Roman Empire and of the Byzantine period had effect on the technical side of agriculture or not. I miss sorely a chapter, at the end of the book, dealing with such matters.

It is interesting and striking to see how enormous was the technical advance in the Hellenistic period as compared with Pharaonic times. It appears probable that many innovations based on the achievements of Hellenistic science were introduced into Egypt by

⁵Most instructive are e. g. the contributions of Professor W. L. Westermann, of Columbia University.

the Romans. Theory was then transformed by the Romans into practice, and new devices were introduced by them into Egypt, devices which had been first employed in Greece, Italy, Africa, and Gaul. Examples are the extensive use of manure, the general replacement of the *shaduf* by the *sakkyeh*, the use of the *plostrum Punicum*, etc.

It is to be regretted that the author did not use to a greater extent the comparative method. For example, in studying the plow, Mr. Schnebel never uses the material which we have from the other provinces of the Roman Empire. That material has been collected several times, most recently by Mr. A. S. F. Gow, in his excellent article, *The Ancient Plow*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 34 (1914), 248-275.

Another regret which I must express is that the author has not used more extensively the archaeological material. His chapters on the agricultural implements, for instance, are brief and not altogether adequate. It is true that few archaeologists have collected the fragments of agricultural implements that have been found in the ruins of the Egyptian cities and villages thus far excavated. Yet many Museums have excellent sets of such implements. The best is in the Royal Ontario Museum, in Toronto, Canada. Many interesting implements are to be found in Museums all over Europe, as well as in the Museums at Cairo and at Alexandria. We may hope that the explorers of the village of Karamis (Messrs. F. W. Kelsey and A. E. R. Boak, of the University of Michigan) will soon fill this gap. Mr. H. E. Winlock, of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, has collected ample evidence in this connection for the Byzantine period (*The Monastery of Epiphanius*, 1.61-67 [1926]). Many interesting contributions to this as well as to other related problems might be made through a careful study of Egyptian terracottas of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, and of the bas-reliefs in the Tomb of Petosiris, recently discovered.

However, Mr. Schnebel's book, as it stands, is a solid contribution to our knowledge of ancient agriculture. The author has collected, carefully, all the material supplied by our written sources, and he has studied all the available books and articles; he has gone into details, and in all controversial subjects has shown sound judgment and expert knowledge both of the ancient sources and of modern agricultural practices. His book will remain the standard work on the subject for the next generation of papyrologists, and will be of especial service to those who are publishing the new sets of papyri. We must not forget that papyrology is still in its infancy, and that for the progress of our work we need the publication of new documents just as sorely as we need the systemization of the knowledge we have already won. All papyrologists and all other students of antiquity will await, eagerly, the appearance of Mr. Schnebel's second volume⁶.

YALE UNIVERSITY

MICHAEL ROSTOVZEFF

⁶For a way in which Mr. Schnebel's book can be of service to a student of the Classics see my remarks on *oses pellitae*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 20.93. C. K. >

The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great. By James Marshall Campbell. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America (1922). Pp. xvi + 156.

Dr. Campbell's monograph, *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great*, is a welcome addition to the interesting series of Patristic Studies produced by the pupils of Professor R. J. Deferrari. It is to be hoped that the number will continue to increase, for there is here a large field with a plentiful harvest, and it might well attract more attention than it does. The Fathers have a reputation for dullness, which is natural at a time when there is little interest in homiletic literature. But, in spite of their bombast, the Fathers of the fourth century contain many interesting echoes of the pagan world, and much acute observation of human nature. If the reader approaches them with a proper degree of patience, he will find much to reward him.

Dr. Campbell has collected the rhetorical figures used by St. Basil, in an attempt to show that he was influenced by the style of contemporary pagan orators and teachers of rhetoric. He devotes two introductory chapters to an Outline History of Greek Rhetoric (1-13) and The New or Second Sophistic (14-31). These provide an adequate introduction to the main part of the dissertation, although Dr. Campbell is a bit too positive in some of his statements about "Asianism". As long as we are dependent for our knowledge of "Asianism" on the partisan statements of Dionysius and a few fragments, it is well not to dogmatize about it.

The main part of the dissertation consists of Chapters III-XIV:

III. Minor Figures of Rhetoric (20-24); IV. Figures of Redundancy (25-31); V. Figures of Repetition (32-38); VI. Figures of Sound (39-43); VII. Figures of Vivacity. Other Devices of Composition (44-64); VIII. Minor Figures Especially Characteristic of the Second Sophistic (65-75); IX. Figures and Devices of the Second Sophistic (76-79); X. Gorgianic Figures and Allied Devices of Parallelism (80-95); XI. The Metaphor (96-109); XII. The Comparison (110-127); XIII. Ecphrasis (128-145); XIV. Conclusion (146-150).

Dr. Campbell is concerned, then, with an enumeration of the figures of rhetoric employed by St. Basil and with statistics of their use by him. The list is exhaustive, including such rare names as *epidiorthosis* and *prokataleipsis*; the collection of examples is apparently thorough and complete. For all the more important figures tables are given showing the number of occurrences in each Sermon. From a study of these examples the author concludes that St. Basil's style was affected by his study in the schools of rhetoric, but that in the use of the scholastic tricks he is less sophist than St. Chrysostom or the two Gregories (148-149). I heartily agree with his conclusion, but must protest just as vigorously that it does not follow from his premises. Anyone with the slightest feeling for Greek prose style who will take pains to assimilate the rhetorical manner of Libanius or Themistius, and then read even for a few hours in the fourth century Christian orators can feel the resemblance between

Pagan and Christian, and the difference between St. Basil and his fellow-Christians. St. Basil is clearly the least artificial of the four; at the same time, in spite of his own statement that he has spent so much time with the patriarchs that he has forgotten the lessons of his school days, the mannerisms of the Sophist still cling to him. So far I thoroughly agree with Dr. Campbell. But, when Dr. Campbell seeks to translate this impression into cold figures, his figures do not prove his statements. He gives us, for example, a table showing the frequency of "repetitive paronomasia" in the Sermons (37-38). He tells us, for instance, that in the *Hexaemera* 1, 2, 3, etc., the number of instances is 2, 3, 5, etc. Now, even as regards St. Basil himself these figures are not satisfactory, for they take no account of the relative length of the different Sermons, and so are useless for comparing different parts of St. Basil's work. Since an author is to be classed as rhetorical or not by the relative frequency of given rhetorical figures, the statistics should be expressed in terms of occurrences per page. But, when the table is followed (38) by the statement that "St. Basil certainly does not exhibit Asiatic excessiveness in the repetitious features of his rhetorical heritage . . .", one may wonder what is the standard of "excessiveness". The point can be settled, of course, in only one way. The relative frequency of rhetorical figures in St. Basil must be compared with the relative frequency in Libanius or in Themistius or in some other admittedly rhetorical writer. A second comparison should then be made with some imaginative orator not included in the Second Sophistic, for instance, Demosthenes, and possibly a third comparison with some matter of fact writer like Strabo. We might then be able to calculate the amount of St. Basil's indebtedness to the Second Sophistic. Even then the task might not be done, for in some cases, in metaphor, for example, his debt is just as great to the succession of imaginative Hebrew prophets.

All this may be granted without detracting from the merits of Dr. Campbell's work. Such an undertaking would be too great for a doctoral dissertation. The body of material is there in Dr. Campbell's monograph awaiting use in a more comprehensive synthesis, which cannot be made until many more such studies shall be available. Incidentally, Dr. Campbell's *obiter dicta* on the rhetorical figures, and on St. Basil's style show keen insight and a fine feeling for Greek prose.

YALE UNIVERSITY

HARRY M. HUBBELL

Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age.
By Sir Samuel Dill. London: Macmillan and Company (1926). Pp. xiii + 566.

At his death in 1924 Sir Samuel Dill left the manuscript of his third great work, Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age, very nearly complete. His friend C. B. Armstrong has published it with but few alterations. Here and there one finds some repetitions and some seemingly incomplete pictures that betray unfinished work. But most of the chapters are fully

rounded out, and the masterly style proves that the author's hand was firm to the last page.

The chief source for this period is of course Gregory of Tours, as bewildering a source for historians as can be found. The unctuous verses of Fortunatus and the 'Saints' Lives' only help to confound the ordinary investigator. This is not a field for a beginner. Sir Samuel Dill, who had had a long experience in weighing dubious sources, who had followed the decline of Roman civilization from Nero's day and had somehow acquired a power of divination in the comprehension of the medieval mind, was preeminently fitted for this task. We are deeply grateful for the book.

It is not light reading. Sir Samuel Dill cared neither to tell a thrilling story nor to paint entertaining pictures. Plot and composition will sell books, but they are too often employed at the expense of truth. What we actually know of the Merovingian Age is merely a lot of disconnected facts, anecdotes, and mere partial glimpses of strange people. It would be dishonest to make a full story out of such material and call it history. What the author has done, apparently, is to index the scattered facts, regroup what normally belonged together, and to give a series of partial impressions of Franks and of Romans, of chieftains and of the people, of clergy and of monks. On the whole it is unsatisfying, but that is the fault of the sources.

The picture will be amazing to those who have not read Gregory. One need not be surprised at the strange mixture of savagery and piety, cruelty and occasional generosity of the barbarian invaders. But what is difficult to comprehend is that Roman culture in Gaul, which promised so well in the society of Ausonius and Sidonius, could be so nearly annihilated within a century, without the annihilation of the Gallo-Roman people. However, the impression is a trifle more gloomy than it would have been if Sir Samuel Dill had chosen to include one more decade and tell of the return of the missionaries who reintroduced classical manuscripts into the monasteries of France. It is a pity that we shall not have that chapter from his pen¹.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

TENNEY FRANK

THE OXFORD TRANSLATION OF ARISTOTLE VOLUMES IX AND XI

The Oxford University Press deserves well of every lover of the Classics because it finds the funds to publish works which can not be commercially profitable.

In this category belongs the great Oxford Translation of Aristotle, long in progress, under the editorial

¹To Professor Frank's appreciative characterization of Sir Samuel Dill's book I append the Table of Contents.

Book I, The Historical Aspect (1-212): I, Events in Gaul from the Fall of the Western Empire to the Accession of Clovis (1-39). II, Early Frank and Burgundian Society in the Codes (40-76). III, The Conquests of Clovis (77-105). IV, The Frank Kingship and Court (106-134). V, The Sons of Clovis (135-212); Book II, The Social Aspect (213-351). I, The Aristocracy (213-234). II, The Life of the Common People in the Merovingian Age (235-267). III, Morals (268-307). IV, Gregory of Tours and his Circle in Auvergne (308-331); Book III, The Ecclesiastical Aspect (333-503). I, Monachism (333-394). II, Saints and Miracles (395-438). III, Church Life (439-475). IV, The Bishops (476-503).

There are also a List of Principal Abbreviations Used in Notes and References (505-506). Notes and References (507-542), and Index (543-566). C. K. >

direction of Mr. W. D. Ross, Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, and Deputy Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. To the translation attention has been called in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.207, 17.112.

Since the latter notice was written, this monumental enterprise has made progress through the publication of Volume XI (1924) and Volume IX (1925).

Volume IX contains versions of the *Ethica Nicomachea*, by W. D. Ross, of the *Magna Moralia*, by St. George Stock, and of the *Ethica Eudemica*, by J. Solomon, of Balliol College. The last two works were translated as long ago as 1915.

Professor Ross uses, in the main, Ingram Bywater's text of the *Ethica Nicomachea*¹. In his very brief Preface he makes the following comment on his translation:

There is considerable difficulty in translating terms which are just crystallizing from the fluidity of everyday speech into technical meanings; and in my treatment of such words as *λόγος* or *ἀρχή* I cannot hope to please everybody. Any attempt to render such a term always by a single English equivalent would produce the most uncouth result, and would be in principle wrong. I have tried, however, to limit my renderings of such terms to a reasonably small number of alternatives², so that the thread of identical significance may not be entirely lost.

This is interesting to me in view of the fact that reviewers have a tendency to complain if, in a version of some Greek or Latin work, a given Greek or Latin word is not rendered always by the same English word.

To his translation of the *Ethica Nicomachea* Professor Ross prefixes six pages, setting forth the contents of Aristotle's work, book by book. This analysis might, it seems to me, have been much more detailed. It is seldom indeed that one finds in an edition or a translation of a classical work an analysis or outline sufficiently detailed to be of real value³. Further, Professor Ross could, without much additional labor, have made much more useful what he does, in fact, present. The account of the contents of Book I begins thus:

BOOK I. THE GOOD FOR MAN

A. *Subject of our inquiry*

I. 1. All human activities aim at some good: some goods subordinate to others.

2. The science of the good for man is politics.

B. *Nature of the science*

3. We must not expect more precision than the subject-matter admits. The student should have reached years of discretion.

It would have helped greatly if exact references had been added to show precisely how much of the *Ethica Nicomachea* is covered by each of the sentences quoted above. Since, to make such an analysis at all,

¹For Professor Ross's competence in matters Aristotelian see a review, by Professor Lane Cooper, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 18.180, of Professor Ross's book, entitled *Aristotle* (London, Methuen, 1923). In *The Classical Review* 38 (1924), 195, Mr. P. W. Dodd also praises this book.

²How can a classical scholar allow himself to speak of "a reasonably small number of alternatives"?

³See my remarks in the *Philological Quarterly* 6 (1927), 39, in the opening paragraphs of a paper entitled *An Analysis of Cicero, Tusculan Disputations, Book I* (6.39-56).

the author had to read through the *Ethica*, it would have involved for him a minimum of labor to add, as he went along, such precise references.

As a specimen of the translation I quote the rendering of 1106 b, end-1107 a (Book 2, Chapter 5, end-Chapter 6, beginning):

Again, it is possible to fail in many ways (for evil belongs to the class of the unlimited, as the Pythagoreans conjectured, and good to that of the limited), while to succeed is possible only in one way (for which reason also one is easy and the other difficult—to miss the mark easy, to hit it difficult); for these reasons, also, then, excess, and defect are characteristic of vice, and the mean of virtue....

Virtue, then, is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean.... Now it is a mean between two vices, that which depends on excess and that which depends on defect; and again it is a mean because the vices respectively fall short of or exceed what is right in both passions and actions, while virtue both finds and chooses that which is intermediate. Hence in respect of its substance and the definition which states its essence virtue is a mean, with regard to what is best and right an extreme.

Professor Ross's Index <Nominum et Rerum> requires 13 pages.

To his version of the *Magna Moralia* Mr. St. George Stock prefixes an Introduction (v-xxiii), in which he discusses the Nicomachean Ethics, the Eudemian Ethics, and the *Magna Moralia*. Points considered are the authorship of the three treatises, the identity of Eudemus, the general resemblance of the Eudemian Ethics to the Nicomachean Ethics, the authorship of the disputed books of the Nicomachean Ethics (5-7: identical with Books 4-6 of the Eudemian Ethics). On the last point his conclusion (xix) is as follows:

While, however, we regard Book V, and with it Books VI and VII, as the genuine outcome of the mind of Aristotle, there is no need to suppose that, in the form in which we have these books, they were written by him. The references in the *Politics* are not necessarily to a written work. They may be only to the author's lectures on Ethics. Part of these lectures have <sic!> come down to us in the written form into which they were put either by Aristotle himself or possibly by his son. But part we have only as worked up by Eudemus and adjusted to his own treatise. That seems to be all that can be said with safety.

I note that the outline of the contents of the treatise, covering ten pages (unnumbered) is arranged in the form, which, as I suggested above, in my discussion of Professor Ross's version of the Nicomachean Ethics, should always be followed in such outlines.

The Index <Rerum> covers four and a half pages, the <Index of> Proper Names less than half a page.

Mr. Solomon gives 23 pages to an outline of the contents of the *Ethica Eudemica*. He employs the right form. His Index <Rerum> covers seven pages.

Volume XI includes versions of the *Rhetorica*, by W. Rhys Roberts, of the *De Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, by E. S. Forster, and of the *De Poetica*, by Ingram Bywater.

Professor Roberts, who is Emeritus Professor of Classics in the University of Leeds, begins his Preface thus:

In making its final volume consist of the *Rhetic* and the *Poetics* (together with the *Rhetic* *ad Alexandrum*—a minor tract of uncertain authorship), the Oxford Translation of Aristotle follows the usual order in which the collected Aristotelian works have come, by tradition, to be arranged. The two great, and most characteristic, treatises which deal with the art of Public Speaking and the art of Poetry bring the long and amazing procession of Aristotle's thought to a fitting close. Language, as the instrument of thought and feeling, is the theme they have in common; language in its workday and its loftiest uses; language which, as the opening chapter of the *Rhetic* sets forth, is the distinctive attribute of man and his best weapon in upholding truth and justice. In the last two words of the *Poetics* as it has come down to us, we may fancy that we hear Aristotle taking leave of all the science, the logic, the metaphysics, and the political and moral wisdom that have gone before: *επειδή τοσαῦτα*, 'Let it suffice to have said thus much'.

Professor Roberts outlines the Rhetic chapter by chapter, in eight and a half pages. He does not, however, mark the limits of his several rubrics. His Index <Nomina et Rerum> covers 14 pages.

Bywater's translation, which appeared originally in his book, Aristotle on the Art of Poetry (1909), is reprinted here. Professor Ross added a short Table, of Contents and an Index <Nomina et Rerum> (a trifle over three pages).

On this translation see my remarks in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.40.

CHARLES KNAPP

Streitberg-Festgabe, Herausgegeben von der Direktion der Vereinigten Sprachwissenschaftlichen Institute an der Universität zu Leipzig. Leipzig: Markert und Petters Verlag (1924). Pp. xv + 441.

The volume issued in celebration of Wilhelm Streitberg's sixtieth birthday consists of fifty-four articles on linguistic topics, of which only eight have a direct bearing upon classical studies.

J. Fraser argues (pages 93-95) that in *Odyssey* 14.161 and 19.306 the word *Auxōs* is a name of Apollo, and that we should translate the phrase *τοῦ Αὐξόντος* by 'during this very <festival of> Apollo'. The word, he maintains, is of Asianic origin; its first element is connected with such place names as *Auxōs*¹, *Auxōn*¹, *Auxōsor*¹, *Auxōnia*¹,

¹The accent of these words is unknown.

etc., while the second element is identical with the first of *βασιλεύς*.

Richard Heinze, Zum Gebrauch des Praesens Historicum im Altlatein (121-132), presents a comprehensive and enlightening survey of the usage of the historical present in Plautus and Terence. His results are of importance for students of the syntax of Latin and of the related languages.

Eduard Hermann, Lateinisch *mi fili* (133-134), ably supports the theory that *mi* is cognate with *μει*, Sanskrit *me*, etc.

Otto Lagerkrantz, Die Drei Dorischen Phylenamen (218-223), finds Indo-European etymologies for *Τλλεῖ* and *Διμᾶντ*, as well as for *Πάμφυλος*.

Evald Liden, Griechische Wörterklärungen (224-229), discusses the etymology of (1) *στέφω*, *στέφανος*, etc., (2) *πυλάω*, 'wreath', and (3) *δρόποι*, *κάναθροι*, 'wagon'.

B. Maurenbrecher, Die Lateinische Ellipsen, Satzbegriff, und Satzformen (220-257), finds ellipsis in Latin only in a few phrases such as *ad Iovis, XIII Kalendas Maias*. The second part of the paper develops a new definition of the word 'sentence'. Then follows a detailed classification of the types of Latin sentences.

Jos. Schrijnen, Silva Lupus in Sabina (336-339), thinks that *lupus* is not of Sabine origin, but is a genuine Latin word, more closely related to *volpes* than to *λύκος*, etc.

One of the most important articles in the book is a paper by F. Saran, entitled Die Quantitätsregeln der Griechen und Römer (299-325). Saran points out the importance for versification of the interval ("Abstandszeit") between the syllabic crests ("Silbenschwerpunkt"), and particularly between the crests of the accented syllables. He goes so far as to say (316), "Auf den Abstandszeiten beruht der metrische Eindruck eines Verses. Also nicht auf den Silbenzeiten". In other words, feet and their subdivisions are to be measured from the beginning of one vowel to the beginning of another, not from the beginning of one syllable to the beginning of another. This is the conclusion which I reached in my article on Syllabification and Syllabic Quantity, published in Transactions of the American Philological Association 53 (1922), 35-51. Unfortunately, the author tries to rescue his earlier theory of syllabic quantity, although it is utterly inconsistent with his revised theory of verse.

YALE UNIVERSITY

E. H. STURTEVANT